

REMARKS

Claims 11-32 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-10 were previously withdrawn from consideration. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C 103

Claims 11-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills et al., U.S. Patent No. 2004/0048503 A1, hereafter referred to as Miller in view of Yokota et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,691,149, hereafter referred to as Yokota. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Claim 11 recites (emphasis added):

A method for copying an application on a portable computer having a main memory and a removable memory, said method comprising:

updating a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory;

choosing an application of said main memory to copy;

changing a category name of said application from a category associated with said main memory to said category associated with said removable memory; and

in response thereto, automatically copying said application to said removable memory.

Independent Claims 17, 22 and 29 recite similar limitations as Independent Claim

11. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that

the combination of Miller and Yokota fails to teach or suggest the claimed

limitations of the present invention. In fact, Miller fails to teach or suggest any limitations of the present invention other than purporting to teach a removable memory. Yokota fails to remedy the deficiencies of Miller and fails to teach or suggest claimed embodiments of the present invention.

Miller, page 2 paragraph [0016]-[0019] is cited as teaching "choosing a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest "choosing a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. Miller purports to teach an adapter for removable memory. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest category names associated with applications, removable memories or main memories, as claimed. Applicants request the Examiner to clearly cite where Miller teaches "choosing a category list to include a name of a category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. Applicants assert that the cited passage of Miller fails to teach or suggest this limitation as claimed.

Miller page 3 paragraphs [0035]-[0038] is cited as teaching "choosing an application name of said application from a category associated with said main memory to said category associated with said removable memory," as claimed. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. Miller purports to teach a removable memory in combination with an external I/O connector for

providing both I/O and memory functions in a single closed-case removable expansion card. This is very different from "choosing an application name of said application from a category associated with said main memory to said category associated with said removable memory," as claimed.

Furthermore, Miller teaches "application specific expansion cards," which implies that the expansion card has a pre-determined application for upgrading the functionality of the device. With Miller, the expansion card comprises an application prior to use in the device. In contrast, the present invention automatically copies the application from the main memory of the device to the expansion card, as claimed.

Miller page 4, paragraphs [0045]-[0046] is cited as teaching "in response thereto, automatically copying said application to said removable memory," as claimed. However, Miller fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. Miller purports to teach a method of digitally encoded media playback. Once again, Miller teaches copying data from the expansion card to memory of the portable device, which teaches away from "automatically copying said application to said removable memory, as claimed."

Miller fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of the present invention. Miller fails to teach or suggest key concepts of the present invention

such as a method of copying an application from a main memory to an expansion card, as taught in independent Claim 11. Independent Claims 17, 22 and 29 recite similar limitations as Independent Claim 11.

Yokota is cited as teaching "choosing a category list" and "choosing an application name of said application from a category" in column 7, lines 34-57 and lines 25-60. Applicants have reviewed the Yokota reference and do not understand Yokota to teach or suggest these limitations, as claimed by embodiments of the present invention. In fact, Yokota teaches away from a key concept of the present invention. In Column 2, lines 39-46, Yokota teaches "return contents formerly moved from the server to the original location when contents are again returned to the server." Embodiments of the present invention are directed towards copied contents and not moved contents, as with Yokota.

Embodiments of the present invention are directed towards category names associated with contents that are copied from a local memory to a removable memory. Yokota fails to teach or suggest copying contents from a local memory to a removable memory in response to changing a category name associated with an application, as claimed. Yokota purports to teach returning contents formerly moved from the server to the original location when contents are again returned to the server. This feature of Yokota does not relate in any way to contents that are copied, as claimed. Furthermore, Yokota fails to teach

or suggest changing a category name of an application to automatically copy the application, as claimed.

For the same rational presented above in conjunction with independent Claim 11, Independent Claims 17, 22 and 29 are patentable over the combination of Miller and Yokota. For example, Miller fails to teach or suggest an electronic device comprising a copy function implemented by said processor wherein an application is copied from said built-in memory to said expansion memory by changing an associated category name of said application, as claimed in independent Claim 17. Furthermore, Yokota fails to remedy the deficiencies of Miller and actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention by teaching returning contents formerly moved from the server to the original location when contents are again returned to the server which does not relate to contents that are copied, as claimed. For this rational, Claims 11-32 are patentable over the combination of Miller and Yokota. As such, Claims 11-32 are in condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 11-32 is earnestly solicited.


CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 12/29, 2005



Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060